

### REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 1-3, 11-14 and 17-19, leaves claims 4-6, 9 and 10 unchanged, cancels claims 7, 8, 15 and 16 and adds new claims 20 and 21. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-6, 9-14 and 17-21.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's indication in the Office Action that claim 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 17 was rewritten to be in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, claim 17 is now allowable as per the Examiner.

It also should be noted that new claim 21 recites features similar to claim 17. Thus, the same reasons for the allowance of claim 17 apply as well to new claim 21.

Claims 1-16, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Yaegashi (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,453). As indicated above, claims 7, 8, 15 and 16 were canceled. Therefore, this rejection with respect to claims 7, 8, 15 and 16 is rendered moot. This rejection with respect to the remaining claims 1-6, 9-14, 18 and 19 is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 1-6, 9-14, 18 and 19 is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 1-6, 9-14, 18 and 19 are not taught or suggested by Yaegashi whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

The features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record particularly Yaegashi whether taken individually or in combination with each other. The present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims provides an image displaying method and apparatus wherein a frame containing a specified image ("a predetermined object") therein is detected from a motion picture on the basis of features processed by the specified image and information of the result of detection is displayed on a motion picture editing screen in a form comprehensible for an editor. Attention is directed to page 11, lines 8-26 of the original specification.

According to the present invention the editor edits video materials to make a video program such as a news program or a drama on the display screen of the computer-aided video editing system. The editor selects "first representative images representing a series of said frame images". The editing system performs "an image detection processing for detecting a predetermined object from a series of frame images corresponding to said selected first representative images". The display shows "a first information showing that said predetermined object is included in a series of said frame images on said screen, as a result of said image detection processing". The above described features of the present invention are recited in each of the independent claims of the present application.

Thus, according to one embodiment of the present invention, when an editor wants to choose some frames including, for example, a "character A", the editor attaches M-icons 1031-1033 (on a screen shown in Fig. 4) to select "first representative images representing a series of said frame images" for detecting the

“character A”. Then, the editor pushes the character detecting button 1051 and the detection processing is started to detect the character A. The display screen shown in Fig. 13 displays the detection result such that the frames including the character A are shown. The other objects “character B” and “character C” are also detected and all the detected results are displayed by the screen image shown in Fig. 1, wherein the frames (250, 251, 252) that “said image detection processing has not been performed yet” are shown. Therefore, according to the present invention, among a vast number of cuts and frames of the stored video materials, the editor can easily and rapidly retrieve and find cuts or frames which include the desired image necessary for making the video program. These features of the present invention as recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record particularly Yaegashi.

In the Abstract of Yaegashi, it is stated that a hierarchical structure of the scenes and cuts are made by arranging and selecting reduced images representing a plurality of video scenes or cuts. However, Yaegashi is silent on how to select the reduced images. Thus, Yaegashi does not teach the image detection processing for detecting a predetermined object from a series of frame images corresponding to said selected first representative images, and further does not teach that said predetermined object is included in a series of said frame images on said screen as recited in the claims. In Yaegashi, when the editor wants to select desired frames which includes the desired image necessary for making the video program, the editor must check all of the frames in a vast number of frames of the stored video materials

by replaying the materials. Thus, Yaegashi requires the editor to take very long time and expend a large amount of work to find the desired frames.

Therefore, as is quite clear from the above, Yaegashi fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(b) rejection of claims 1-6, 9-14, 18 and 19 as being anticipated by Yaegashi is respectfully requested.

As indicated above, the present Amendment adds new claims 20 and 21. New claim 20 recites many of the same features shown above not to be taught or suggested by Yaegashi. Therefore, the same arguments presented above with respect to claims 1-6, 9-14, 18 and 19 apply as well to new claim 20.

As noted above, new claim 21 recites features similar to those recited in claim 17. Therefore, new claim 21 is allowable for the same reasons as allowable claim 17.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the reference utilized in the rejection of claims 1-19.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-6, 9-14 and 17-21 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-6, 9-14 and 17-21 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (500.38276X00).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



---

Carl I. Brundidge  
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc  
(703) 312-6600